

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/615,314	07/07/2003	Henrik Sonderskov Klint	8627-233	9363
75	90 04/05/2005		EXAM	INER
J. Matthew Buchanan			NICOLAS, FREDERICK C	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL 60610			3754	

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

: *	Application No.	No. Applicant(s)				
Office Asticus Occurrence	10/615,314	KLINT, HENRIK SONDERSKOV				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Frederick C. Nicolas	3754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days fill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 Ma	arch 2005.					
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>35 and 37</u> is/are pending in the application	☑ Claim(s) <u>35 and 37</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	n from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		-				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>35 and 37</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>35 and 37</u> are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	-				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce	epted or b) \square objected to by the E	Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the o	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,					
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	n-(d) or (f).				
_						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of						
dee the attached detailed Office action for a list t	or the certified copies not receive	u.				
Attachment(s)		-				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate atent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3754

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments, filed 3/15/2005, with respect to claims 35 and 37 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 35 and 37 have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Laptewicz et al. 5,653,684 in view of Gore et al. 5,733,400.

Laptewicz et al. disclose discloses a catheter system (col. 3, II, 7-28), which comprises a catheter (1) having a distal end, a body portion having at least one lumen with an inside surface extending through the body portion in longitudinal direction from a proximal end toward the distal end, at least one central member (7), a pusher member (6), a self-expandable prosthesis (2). Laptewicz et al. lack that the body portion made of a multiple filament helically wound row of wires, and the row of wires has a pitch angle in the range of 26° to 76°. Gore et al. teach the use of a catheter body portion (14), where the catheter body portion is made of a multiple filament helically wound row of wires (col. 4, II. 30-67 onto col. 5, II. 1-60).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the catheter body portion of Laptewicz et al. with the

Art Unit: 3754

catheter body portion (14) of Gore et al., in order to provide a catheter of increasing in flexibility toward the distal end of the catheter, as taught by Gore et al. in (col. 3, II. 8-14).

Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wires pitch angle of Laptewicz et al. and Gore et al. to have a pitch angle in the range of 26° to 76°, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. As per MPEP 2144.05

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Taguchi et al. 4,909,789, Stevens 5,370,685, Wijay 5,643,278, Heller et al. 5,843,092 and Amann et al. 6,066,155 disclose other types of catheter system.

Response to Arguments

- 5. Applicant's arguments filed 3/15/2005 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frederick C. Nicolas whose telephone number is (571)-272-4931. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/615,314

Art Unit: 3754

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y Mar, can be reached on 571-272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

FΝ

March 30, 2005

Frederick C. Nicolas

Patent Examiner